

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 24, 35-39, 59, 72-76, 91, 96-100, and 123-127 are now in the application. Claims 24, 35-39, 59, 72-76, 91, 96-100, and 123-127 are subject to examination. Claims 24, 35, 59, 72, 91, 96, and 123 have been amended. Claims 1-23, 25-34, 40-58, 60-71, 77-90, 92-95, 101-122, and 128-135 have been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Under the heading "Informalities or Claim Objections" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 15 and 48 because they depend from canceled claims.

Claims 15 and 48 have been canceled.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 and 77 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 has been canceled. The limitations of claim 1, which have been added to claims 24 and 35, now refer to the base solder or stud bumps.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided

solely for clarification or cosmetic reasons. The changes are neither provided for overcoming the prior art nor do they narrow the scope of the claim for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1, 4-5, 7, 20, 40 and 44 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,774,434 to Bennion under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Please see the discussion of the allowable subject matter.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1, 40 and 65-70 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,345,903 to Koike et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Please see the discussion of the allowable subject matter.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 6 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 77, 82, 85, 89, 95 and 101-102 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2001/0030866 to Hochstein under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Please see the discussion of the allowable subject matter.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 7 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 3, 41-42 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,774,434 to Bennion under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Please see the discussion of the allowable subject matter.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 8 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 133-134 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,345,903 to Koike et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Please see the discussion of the allowable subject matter.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 8 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 6 and 43 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,774,434 to Bennion and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,565,705 to Romero et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Please see the discussion of the allowable subject matter.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 9 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 15, 19, 23, 48, 53, 57-58 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,774,434 to Bennion and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,813,753 to Vriens et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Please see the discussion of the allowable subject matter.

Under the heading “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” on page 9 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 28-29, 31-34, 65-66 and 68-70 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,774,434 to Bennion and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0030866 to Hochstein under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Please see the discussion of the allowable subject matter.

Under the heading “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” on page 10 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 84, 86-87 and 90-91 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0030866 to Hochstein and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,345,903 to Koike et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Please see the discussion of the allowable subject matter.

Under the heading “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” on page 11 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 104 and 116 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,345,903 to Koike et al. and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0030866 to Hochstein under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Please see the discussion of the allowable subject matter.

Under the heading "Allowable Subject Matter" on page 13 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 24, 35-39, 59, 72-76, 91, 96-100, and 123-127 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner indicated that they "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

The indication of Allowability is appreciated and these claims have been rewritten as the Examiner suggested.

Five independent claims were previously in the application. Two additional independent claims have been added. The fee for two additional independent claims in the amount of \$440.00 has been included with this response.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 24, 31, 59, 72, 91, 96, or 123. Claims 24, 31, 59, 72, 91, 96, and 123 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 35, 72, 96, or 123.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 24, 35-39, 59, 72-76, 91, 96-100, and 123-127 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/  
Mark P. Weichselbaum  
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

October 23, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP  
P.O. Box 2480  
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480  
Tel.: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101